

Due Date: February 12, 2008

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:)
)
)
Inventor: Kenneth A. Vadella et al.) Examiner: Charles E. Anya
)
)
Serial #: 10/607,119) Group Art Unit: 2194
)
)
Filed: June 26, 2003) Appeal No.: _____
)
)
Title: COMMUNICATION MECHANISM)
)
)
BETWEEN DISCONNECTED APPLICATIONS)
)
)
IN A WEB BROWSER)

REPLY BRIEF

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In accordance with 37 CFR §41.41, Appellants hereby submit the Appellants' Reply Brief on Appeal from the final rejection in the above-identified application, as set forth in the Office Actions dated March 29, 2007 and June 18, 2007 and the Examiner's Answer dated December 12, 2007.

No fee is due at this time. However, should any fees be necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0494 of Gates & Cooper LLP.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Autodesk, Inc., the assignee of the present application.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences for the above-referenced patent application.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected.

Appellants are appealing the rejection of claims 1-24.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments to the claims have been made subsequent to the final Office Action.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Briefly, Appellants' invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 13, is generally directed to an invention that performs enabling communication between disconnected applications (see paragraph [0003]- page 2, lines 11-14). More specifically, disconnected applications as used in the present invention and as explicitly claimed therein provide that a disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application (see paragraph [0007]-page 3, line 23-page 4, line 6; paragraph [0029]-page 10, lines 2-17; paragraph [0047]-page 15, lines 19-22; FIGs. 2, 3, 4, and 5). In this regard, the disconnected applications of the present invention are applications that do not know anything about each other. One application (referred to in the claims as a secondary application) creates a bridge object (FIGs. 4 and 5; paragraphs [0044]-[0045]-page 14, line 22-page 15, line 9). Such a bridge object is not part of either application and allows the applications to communicate with each other through an interface (paragraph [0049]-page 14, lines 10-15; FIGs. 4 and 5). In this regard, the claims explicitly provide that an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object (paragraph [0049]-page 14, lines 10-15; FIGs. 4 and 5). The interface for the

bridge object is registered in a global interface table (GIT) and a cookie is retrieved (from the GIT) in response (paragraph [0048]-page 15, line 23-page 16, line 9; paragraph [0050]-page 16, line 16-page 17, line 3; paragraph [0053]; page 17, lines 14-21; FIGs. 4 and 5). Such a cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object. The claims then explicitly provide for storing the cookie in a location that is accessible to the disconnected application such that the cookie can be retrieved to enable use of the interface (paragraph [0048]-page 15, line 23-page 16, line 9; paragraph [0050]-page 16, line 16-page 17, line 3; paragraph [0053]; page 17, lines 14-21; FIGs. 4 and 5).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 1-24 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious over Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterface Table (IGlobalInterfaceTable) pages 1-2 in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0205734 to Srinivasan et al (Srinivasan). Such ground is presented for review herein.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Claims 1-24 Are Patentable Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterface Table (IGlobalInterfaceTable) pages 1-2 in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0205734 to Srinivasan et al (Srinivasan).

1. Independent Claims 1, 7, and 13

In view of the above-described limitations, there are several unique, novel, and nonobvious aspects of the invention. Such aspects include the storage of the cookie in any globally accessible location. The prior art fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the use or storage of the cookie whatsoever. A second aspect includes that the applications are disconnected/independent and are unaware of each other – yet can communicate via the bridge object. A third aspect is that the interface bridge object is not part of either application. A fourth aspect is that the interface placed in the GIT is from the bridge object, rather than from either application. Again, the applications have no direct connection to each other and are disconnected (yet can communicate via the bridge object and the information contained in the

GIT).

On pages (2)-(6) of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterfaceTable (IGlobalInterfaceTable) and Srinivasan et al., U.S. Publication 2004/020734 (Srinivasan).

Specifically, claim 1, 7 and 13 was rejected as follows:

As to claim 1, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches a computer-implemented method for enabling communication between applications (“...any apartment...any other apartment...” page 1 line 3), comprising: creating a bridge object in a secondary application (“...an object...” page 1 line 1), wherein an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object (“...an interface...” page 1 line 1); registering the interface for the bridge object in a global interface table (GIT) (“Register...” page 1 lines 5/37-38, “...register...” page 2 line 5); retrieving a cookie from the GIT in response to the registration, wherein the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object (“...a cookie...” page 2 line 6, “...get a cookie...” page 2 line 5); and storing the cookie in an environment variable, wherein the environment variable is accessible to a application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface (“...GetInterfacefaceFromglobal method...this cookie...” page 1 lines 39-41).

IGlobalInterfaceTable is silent with reference to disconnected applications. Tock teaches disconnected applications (“...offline...” page 1 paragraph 0007, “...disconnected state...” page 9 paragraph 0096).

Srinivasan teaches disconnected applications (Active X Components 135 page 1 paragraph 0008) and the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application (“...cannot directly call...” page 1 paragraphs 0008/0011).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tock and IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of Tock would improve the system of IGlobalInterfaceTable by providing a method for allowing a client application to operate offline from a server (Tock page 1 paragraph 0007).

As to claims 7 and 13, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Appellants traverse the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

- (1) Neither IGlobalInterfaceTable nor Srinivasan teach, disclose or suggest the storage of the cookie in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application;
- (2) Neither IGlobalInterfaceTable nor Srinivasan teach, disclose or suggest a disconnected application that is unaware of the secondary application; and
- (3) Neither IGlobalInterfaceTable nor Srinivasan teach, disclose or suggest a secondary application and disconnected application executing within the same process but in different apartments.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action primarily relies on the IGlobalInterfaceTable reference. Specifically, with respect to the storage of the cookie in a location accessible to the disconnected application (e.g., an environment variable), the Office Action refers to page 1, lines 39-41. Page 1, lines 37-41 provides:

After calling the CoCreateInstance function, register the interface you want to make available processwide from the apartment in which it resides with a call to the RegisterInterfaceInGlobal method. This supplies a pointer to a "cookie" (through the *pdwCookie* parameter) that identifies the interface and its location. An apartment that wants a pointer to this interface then calls the GetInterfaceFromGlobal method with this cookie, and the implementation then supplies an interface pointer to the calling apartment. To revoke the interface's global registration, any apartment may call the RevokeInterfaceFromGlobal method.

As can be seen from this text (and the remainder of IGlobalInterfaceTable), there is no description, explicit or implicit, regarding the storage or what to do with the cookie. Instead, the reference merely describes the supplying of a pointer to a cookie that identifies an interface and its location. A method is then called with the cookie and an interface is supplied to a calling apartment. In this regard, the cookie of IGlobalInterfaceTable could merely be passing around the cookie as an argument to various functions. The present claims are unique in that the cookie of the claimed invention is stored in a location that is accessible to both the disconnected application and the secondary application. For example, the cookie could be stored in a globally accessible location such as a database, file system, or registry. The dependent claims explicitly provide that the location comprises an environment variable. Nowhere in IGlobalInterfaceTable is there any description, suggestion, or remote reference to the storing of the cookie in any location, not to mention the storage in an environment variable as claimed.

In response to the above, arguments, the final Office Action essentially repeats the rejections. Appellants again reassert that above and note that lines 39-41 of IGlobalInterfaceTable provide for supplying a pointer to a cookie that identifies the interface and its location. The "its location" modifies the term interface and describes the location of the interface. In this regard, the location described in IGlobalInterfaceTable does not refer to the location of the cookie itself. Such a location of a cookie is not contemplated in IGlobalInterfaceTable.

In view of the above, Appellants note that the present application addressed security issues that needed to be addressed because of the use of a web browser. To overcome the security limitations imposed by such a web browser, the particular use and method of the cookie and bridge were developed (and is currently set forth in the claims). Such a methodology did not exist in the past. In this regard, the IGlobalInterfaceTable reference clearly falls within the prior art and does not provide a method for accessing the bridge object or storing a cookie (containing information for such a bridge object) in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application. Again, IGlobalInterfaceTable completely fails to teach, disclose, or suggest, explicitly or implicitly, any storage of a cookie in a globally accessible location. In addition, the use and manner of use of the cookie is neither taught nor disclosed in IGlobalInterfaceTable.

In response to the above argument, the Examiner's Answer provides:

As to point (1), as the final rejection of 3/29/07 indicates, the Examiner admits that the IGlobalInterfaceTable prior art does not teach a disconnected application, however, it does teach communication between apartments (applications) in a process. To allow these apartments communicate an IGlobalInterfaceTable via CoCreateInstance creates an object and registers its interface, thus allowing for transparent communication between the apartments (applications). A pointer to the interface is **stored** as a cookie in a location accessible to an apartment wanting to call another apartment. An apartment that wants to call another apartment gets the stored cookie via a GetInterfaceFromGlobal method from **its stored location** and subsequently makes the call or invokes the service. Therefore, contrary to Appellant's assertion, the IGlobalInterfaceTable prior art does teach a cookie associated with an interface and stored in a location accessible to an (disconnected) application (apartment) and allows for transparent communication between a secondary application and (disconnected) application (apartments).

Appellants respectfully disagree with and traverse such assertions. Again, the reference cited is merely consistent with the prior art. In this regard, the cited reference completely and entirely fails to describe where the cookie is stored. Instead, a pointer to the cookie is supplied and may be provided to the apartment that wants the point to the interface stored in the cookie. However, what is notoriously lacking from the cited reference is a description of where the cookie is stored and any attributes relating to that storage location. The independent claims explicitly and expressly provide:

the cookie is stored in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface, and **wherein the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application.** (Emphasis added)

Appellants note that nowhere in the cited reference is there any mention, explicit or implicit regarding whether the apartments maintain knowledge about each other. In fact, IGlobalInterfaceTable fails to describe any attributes relating to the applications (disconnected or otherwise) that may be accessing the cookie. Further, the reference is silent regarding the storage location of the cookie.

In addition, the claims explicitly provide that the information in the cookies for an interface for a bridge object that enables communication with a secondary application (through the bridge object). Such a claim limitation is wholly and completely lacking from the cited references.

The Office Action continues and submits that IGlobalInterfaceTable is silent with respect to disconnected applications and the disconnected application being unaware of the secondary application. Instead, the Office Action relies on Srinivasan. Appellants respectfully traverse such an assertion. As set forth in the claim limitations, the disconnected applications of the present invention do not refer to applications that are merely unable to directly call each other. Instead, the claim limitations explicitly provide that the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application. Srinivasan paragraph [0007] serves to actually teach away from such a limitation. In this regard, paragraph [0007] describes a COM client looking for a calculator through a Jini brokering service. In this regard, the COM client is explicitly aware of a calculator. In fact, the COM client searches by specifying GUIDs on behalf of a client. The Jini broker finds the desired ActiveX component and returns Java objects. Thus, contrary to that asserted in the final Office Action, the applications are clearly aware of each other.

Further, rather than utilizing a cookie to retrieve information for utilizing an interface for a bridge object, the Jini application merely wraps serialized object code as an ActiveX Java service so that it can be accessed by a COM application (see paragraph [0008]). Such a use is not even remotely relevant to the present claims. In this regard, wrapping up an object so that a COM application can use a Java object is not similar in any way, shape, or form, to the explicit and specific limitations set forth in the present application.

In response to the above asserted arguments, the Advisory Action merely states that the Examiner maintains that the final rejection of 3/29/07 covers the invention as claimed.

In response to the above arguments, the Examiner's Answer provides:

As to point (2), although the IGlobalInterfaceTable prior art does teach an apartment that transparently (unaware) communicates with another apartment via an interface, it does not teach **a disconnected application** that is unaware of a secondary application hence the introduction of the Srinivasan prior art. Appellant's specification is replete with the disclosure that the disconnected application and secondary application are ActiveX control component associated (page 5 paragraph 0011, page 7 paragraph 0029, page 11 paragraph 0033, page 16 paragraph 0050). The Srinivasan prior art disclosed com application (COM Application 110) which serves as the disconnected application because it is ActiveX control component associated. The com application is unaware or cannot directly call the service it is requesting and as a result relies upon a bridge (Bridge 120) to transparently communicate or call the service. Therefore the Srinivasan prior art does teach a disconnected application (COM Application) that is unaware of the secondary application (service) because it provides a bridge (Bridge 120) that allows the applications to communicate transparently.

Appellants respectfully disagree with and traverse the above assertions. Rather than relying on the reference, the Answer directs the attention of the Board to Applicants specification page 5 paragraph 0011, page 7, paragraph 0029, page 11 paragraph 0033, and page 16 paragraph 0050. The Answer then asserts that such text describes associated ActiveX controls/components. However, such a statement is a complete mischaracterization of the text. The cited paragraphs provide:

[0011] One or more embodiments of the invention enable communication between two disconnected applications (referred to as a secondary application and disconnected/controlling application) (e.g., between a project hosting environment/application and ActiveX controls within a web page). To enable such communication, an object that acts as a bridge between the applications is established/created on/by one application.

...

[0029] As described above, a disconnected application (such as an ActiveX control) may desire to communicate with a secondary application (such as a hosting environment) via a COM-based interface or interfaces. For example, FIG. 2 illustrates a secondary application 202 (such as a hosting environment - e.g., ProjectPoint) that has created a web browser (e.g., INTERNET EXPLORER™) control 204 (also referred to as a controlling application 204) to host an HTML (hyper text markup language) page 206. The HTML page 206 provides a disconnected application 208. In this regard, the HTML page 206 may instantiate ActiveX controls (e.g., Streamline client controls) in accordance with one or more embodiments of the invention. In view of FIG. 2, the issue is how to get a COM-based interface from the secondary application 202 to the disconnected application 208. As a side issue, it may be preferable for the disconnected application 208 to be "blissfully ignorant" of the secondary application 202. Such ignorance would provide the ability to host the disconnected application 208 in other (future) environments/applications 202 without the need for substantial additional programming or coding rework. For example, a secondary application 202 may comprise a "stand alone viewer" that hosts the ActiveX controls.

...

[0033] An example of a particular secondary application 202/project hosting environment that hosts ActiveX controls is EROOM™ (hereinafter eRoom) (an environment available from eRoom Technology, Inc. of Cambridge Massachusetts). In the eRoom environment, ActiveX controls are able to save a markup file to a server.

...

[0050] Thus, as described above, prior to creating a web page 206, the secondary application 202 creates a client host bridge 402 and registers an interface for the bridge 402 in the global interface table 406. The resulting cookie is then stored in an environment variable 408. When the web page 206 and/or disconnected application 208 (e.g., containing ActiveX controls) is created, the disconnected application 208 retrieves the cookie from the environment variable 408. The cookie may then be used to obtain, retrieve, or create an interface object 404 that the disconnected application 208 may use to interact with the secondary application 202. Accordingly, the cookie may be retrieved (and used to create the interface 404) at construction time, and may not be passed through the hosting HTML page 206. However, alternative retrieval times may also be within the scope of the present invention.

As can be seen, paragraph [0011] provides that the disconnected applications are between a project hosting environment/application and ActiveX controls within a web page (such a project hosting environment is described in more detail throughout the specification including the background on pages 3-4 paragraphs [0006]-[0010]). Paragraph [0029] again describes that the ActiveX control may communicate with a hosting environment that is disconnected. Similarly, paragraph [0033] again provides that the project hosting environment hosts ActiveX controls. Further, paragraph [0050] describes more details regarding the present invention and the use of a bridge to communicate between the two disconnected applications.

Thus, contrary to that asserted by the Examiner, the presently claimed invention (and as described in the specification) clearly describes disconnected applications. Appellants note that as stated above, Srinivasan's COM client is explicitly aware of a calculator and the other application. However, the present claims explicitly provide that the disconnected application is "unaware of the secondary application". Thus, Srinivasan serves to teach away from the present invention. The Answer refers to Srinivasan's "bridge 120". However, as stated above, Srinivasan's "bridge 120" is merely serialized object code that is wrapped as an ActiveX Java service so that it can be accessed by a COM application (see Srinivasan paragraph [0008]). Again, contrary to that set forth in the Patent Office correspondence, Srinivasan's Jini Bridge is well aware of the application and vice versa.

The Answer states that the claimed disconnected application is the COM application and the secondary application is a service that communicates via the Bridge 120. However, as stated in Srinivasan, COM applications cannot directly call services and therefore the bridge 120 serializes object code and wraps it as an ActiveX Java service 135 that can be accessed by the

COM application 110 (see paragraph [0008]). Thus, rather than the applications being unaware of a secondary application (as claimed), Srinivasan's COM application is well aware of the services available from the Java objects and uses a Jini bridge that merely wraps these services into an ActiveX control to call them. Such a teaching serves to teach away from the presently claimed invention which expressly requires that the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application. In Srinivasan, all of the applications are aware of each other.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

2. Dependent Claims 2, 8, and 14

Dependent claims 2, 8, and 14 provide that the secondary application is a project hosting environment. In rejecting these claims, the final Office Action relies on Srinivasan (application 110, page 1, paragraphs 0007-0010).

Appellants note that Srinivasan's Jini application is a stand alone application rather than an application executing in a web browser or a project hosting environment. Nowhere in Srinivasan is there even a remote reference to a project or of a host. In this regard, separate electronic searches of Srinivasan for the terms "project" and "host" provides no results whatsoever. Without even mentioning the word "project" or the word "host", Srinivasan cannot possibly disclose or render obvious a hosting environment for a project.

In response to the above arguments, the Examiner's Answer provides:

As to point (4), the secondary application which as disclosed and/or claimed comprises project hosting environment and instantiates or hosts ActiveX controls. The Srinivasan prior art in satisfying this claim limitation discloses a com application that calls or invokes services of an application (secondary application) and these services hosted by the application are ActiveX controls/components

Appellants respectfully disagree with and traverse such an assertion. Again, as stated above, these claims provide that the secondary application is a project hosting environment. Thus, as claimed, the secondary application that creates the bridge object is a project hosting environment. The other dependent claims (e.g., claims 3, 9, and 15) provide that the disconnected application is an ActiveX control (i.e., it is different from the project hosting environment that creates the bridge object). In rejecting these dependent claims, the Answer

again refers to a COM application that invokes services of an application that are ActiveX controls. However, such text still fails to teach, describe, or suggest, explicitly or implicitly, a project, a host, or any capability of such a project or host to create a bridge object (as claimed).

Instead, Srinivasan is silent about who is creating a bridge object. All that is occurring in Srinivasan is a COM container application attempting dynamic discovery of services such as a calculator. In such a discovery process, “the system begins looking for service by representing interest in the service to the Jinibroker 100”. Further an application 110 provides the information 115 request to the Jini bridge 120. Again, such a description fails to create any bridge object whatsoever. Instead, the COM container application is searching for objects and uses a Jini broker to find the application. However, as claimed, the present secondary application creates the bridge object.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

3. Dependent Claims 3, 9, and 15 are Not Separately Argued

4. Dependent Claims 4, 10, and 16

Dependent claims 4, 10, and 16 provide that the registering of the interface for the bridge object places a pointer to the interface for the bridge object in the global interface table. In rejecting these claims, the final Office Action merely refers to the interface pointer on page 1 lines 8-9 of the IGlobalInterfaceTable reference.

As stated above, one of the unique elements of the invention is that tbrdige object is not part of either application and the interface is from the bridge object rather than from either application. Dependent claims 4, 10, and 16 provide further limitations in this regard and specify that the registering of the interface places a pointer to the interface FOR THE BRIDGE OBJECT in the global interface table. The cited portion of IGlobalInterfaceTable merely supplies a pointer to a cookie that identifies the interface and its location. Such a pointer to a cookie is not a pointer to an interface as claimed. In this regard, a cookie is not an interface. As claimed, the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface. Appellants also direct the attention of the Board to claims 5, 11, and 17 discussed below.

The above arguments were not addressed in the Examiner's Answer.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

5. Dependent Claims 5, 11, and 17

Dependent claims 5, 11, and 17 depend on claims 4, 10, and 16 and provide that the cookie identifies the pointer and a location of the interface. In rejecting these claims, the final Office Action merely recites the term "identifies" on page 1, line 39 of IGlobalInterfaceTable.

When viewing these claims in combination with claims 4, 10, and 16, Appellants note that it would be impossible to accept the Examiner's arguments with respect to claims 4, 10, and 16. In this regard, IGlobalInterfaceTable provides a pointer to a cookie while these claims provides that the cookie identifies the pointer to the interface. Such a contradiction cannot be rationalized. If IGlobalInterfaceTable provides a pointer to a cookie, then the same language cannot be used to indicate that the cookie identifies the pointer and location of the interface.

The above arguments were not addressed in the Examiner's Answer.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

6. Dependent Claims 6, 12, and 18

Dependent claims 6, 12, and 18 provide for a disconnected application: extracting the cookie from the location, accessing the cookie to enable use of the interface for the bridge object, and communicating with the secondary application using the interface for the bridge object.

In rejecting these claims, the final Office Action recites the "GetInterfaceFromGlobal method" on page 1, lines 40-41 and the disconnected application from Srinivasan (ActiveX Component 135 page 1 paragraph 0008).

Appellants respectfully disagree with and traverse the rejections. As set forth in IGlobalInterfaceTable, the GetInterfaceFromGlobal method is called with the cookie which supplies an interface pointer to a calling apartment. However, such a description fails to teach, describe, or suggest the extracting of a cookie from a location that is accessible to a disconnected application as claimed. Further, as stated above, Srinivasan's ActiveX component is not equivalent to a disconnected application as claimed. Again, the claimed disconnected

application is unaware of the secondary application while Srinivasan's components is fully aware and actually teaches away from such a lack of knowledge as claimed.

The above arguments were not addressed in the Examiner's Answer.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

7. Dependent Claims 19, 21, and 23

Dependent claims 19, 21, and 23 provide for storing the cookie in an environment variable.

In rejecting these claims, the final Office Action merely recites IGlobalInterfaceTable page 1, lines 38-41. Such a description does not even remotely reference an environment variable. In fact, Appellants submit that a use of an environment variable is not even contemplated or mentioned anywhere in IGlobalInterfaceTable. Again, the claims provide for explicit claim limitations. Under MPEP §2142 and 2143.03 “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” The Office Action cannot merely ignore the claim limitations directed towards environment variables and recite a location of an interface, which has no relevance with respect to the storage of a cookie.

Instead of teaching such an environment variable, IGlobalInterfaceTable merely teaches a pointer to a “cookie” that identifies an interface and its location. Such a teaching does not contemplate, explicitly or implicitly, an environment variable nor the storage of the cookie in such an environment variable.

The above arguments were not addressed in the Examiner's Answer.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

8. Dependent Claims 20, 22, and 24

Dependent claims 20, 22, and 24 provide that the secondary application and the disconnected application are executing within a same process but in different apartments. Thus,

as claimed, while both applications are in the same process, they are unaware of each other. Such a capability is wholly and completely lacking from IGlobalInterfaceTable.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner's Answer provides:

As to point (3), contrary to Applicant's assertion the IGlobalInterfaceTable prior art do teach a secondary application and disconnected application that executes within the same process because the different apartments execute in the **same process** (page 1 lines 3-4).

Appellants respectfully disagree with and traverse such assertions. As claimed, while in the same process, both applications are unaware of each other. Both the Office Actions and Answer fail to even consider such claim limitations. While the Action addresses execution in the same process, the fact remains that IGlobalInterfaceTable fails to determine whether the applications are aware of each other while remaining in the same process (as claimed).

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections.

B. Conclusion

In light of the above arguments, Appellants respectfully submit that the cited references do not anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention. More specifically, Appellants' claims recite novel physical features which patentably distinguish over any and all references under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. As a result, a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reversing the Examiner and directing allowance of the pending claims in the subject application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Appellant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: February 12, 2008

By: Jason S. Feldmar
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/

G&C 30566.243-US-U1

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A computer-implemented method for enabling communication between disconnected applications, comprising:
 - a secondary application creating a bridge object, wherein an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object;
 - registering the interface for the bridge object in a global interface table (GIT);
 - retrieving a cookie from the GIT in response to the registration, wherein the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object; and
 - storing the cookie in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface, and wherein the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein the secondary application comprises a project hosting environment.
3. The method of claim 1, wherein the disconnected application comprises an ActiveX control.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein the registering of the interface for the bridge object in the GIT comprises placing a pointer to the interface for the bridge object in the GIT.
5. The method of claim 4, wherein the cookie identifies the pointer and a location of the interface.
6. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
 - the disconnected application extracting the cookie from the location;
 - the disconnected application accessing the cookie to enable use of the interface for the bridge object; and

the disconnected application communicating with the secondary application using the interface for the bridge object.

7. An apparatus for enabling communication between disconnected applications in a computer system comprising:

- (a) a computer system having a memory and a data storage device coupled thereto;
- (b) a secondary application performed by the computer;
- (c) a bridge object created by the secondary application, wherein an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object;
- (d) a global interface table (GIT) configured to:
 - (i) accept registration of the interface for the bridge object;
 - (ii) return a cookie in response to the registration, wherein the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object; and
- (e) a location configured to store the cookie, wherein the location is accessible to a disconnected application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface.

8. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the secondary application comprises a project hosting environment.

9. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the disconnected application comprises an ActiveX control.

10. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the GIT accepts the registration of the interface for the bridge object by storing a pointer to the interface for the bridge object.

11. The apparatus of claim 10, wherein the cookie identifies the pointer and a location of the interface.

12. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the disconnected application is configured to:

extract the cookie from the location;
access the cookie to enable use of the interface for the bridge object; and
communicate with the secondary application using the interface for the bridge object.

13. An article of manufacture comprising a program storage medium readable by a computer and embodying one or more instructions executable by the computer to perform a method for enabling communication between disconnected applications in a computer system, the method comprising:

a secondary application creating a bridge object, wherein an interface for the bridge object enables communication with the secondary application through the bridge object;

registering the interface for the bridge object in a global interface table (GIT);

retrieving a cookie from the GIT in response to the registration, wherein the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object; and

storing the cookie in a location that is accessible to a disconnected application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface.

14. The article of manufacture of claim 13, wherein the secondary application comprises a project hosting environment.

15. The article of manufacture of claim 13, wherein the disconnected application comprises an ActiveX control.

16. The article of manufacture of claim 13, wherein the registering of the interface for the bridge object in the GIT comprises placing a pointer to the interface for the bridge object in the GIT.

17. The article of manufacture of claim 16, wherein the cookie identifies the pointer and a location of the interface.

18. The article of manufacture of claim 13, wherein the method further comprises:
the disconnected application the cookie from the location;
the disconnected application accessing the cookie to enable use of the interface for the
bridge object; and
the disconnected application communicating with the secondary application using the
interface for the bridge object.

19. The method of claim 1, wherein the location comprises an environment variable.

20. The method of claim 1, wherein the secondary application and disconnected
application are executing within a same process but in different apartments.

21. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the location comprises an environment
variable.

22. The apparatus of claim 7, wherein the secondary application and disconnected
application are executing within a same process but in different apartments.

23. The article of manufacture of claim 16, wherein the location comprises an
environment variable.

24. The article of manufacture of claim 16, wherein the secondary application and
disconnected application are executing within a same process but in different apartments.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.